## REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-12 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

### I. Formal Matters

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner notes that the phrase "edit control" is indefinite because the claimed feature allegedly has nothing to do with an editing function. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, and 11 have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

### II. Prior Art Rejections

#### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,995,921 to Richards et al. (hereinafter "Richards"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method for providing computer software help utility comprises after receiving a search string at the text entry area, storing the search string in a list of most recently used search strings; retrieving the list of most recently used search strings; and displaying the list of most recently used search strings. Similarly, as amended, claim 7 recites that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform the steps of after receiving a search string at the text entry area, storing the search string in a list of most recently used search strings; retrieving the list of most recently used search strings; and displaying the list of most recently used search strings.

Richards does not teach or suggest a method for providing computer software help utility or a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions as recited in claims 1 and 7. On the contrary, Richards discloses a method of providing information to a user by receiving user-defined queries, storing a plurality of predefined information segments (help panels) in a memory, selecting one of the predefined information segments which corresponds to the user query according to a predetermined criteria, and presenting the selected information segment to the user. However, this is not analogous to the method or computer software recited in claims 1 and 7 because although the predefined information segments (help panels) selected based on the user-defined queries are stored and presented to the user, Richards fails to teach or suggest that the *user-defined queries* are stored in a list of most recently used user-defined queries, retrieved, and displayed. Thus, Richards fails to teach or suggest a method for providing computer software help utility or a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions as recited in claims 1 and 7.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Richards. Since claims 2-4 and 8-10 depend respectively from claims 1 and 7 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Richards does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-4 and 8-10 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

A description of the recitation of claims 1 and 7 may be relied upon above.

Richards does not teach or suggest a method for providing computer software help utility or a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions as recited in claims 1 and 7. Instead, Richards discloses a method of providing information to a user by receiving user-defined queries, storing a plurality of predefined information segments (help panels) in a memory, selecting one of the

predefined information segments which corresponds to the user query according to a predetermined criteria, and presenting the selected information segment to the user. However, as discussed above, this is not analogous to the method or computer software recited in claims 1 and 7 because although the predefined information segments (help panels) selected based on the user-defined queries are stored and presented to the user, Richards fails to teach or suggest that the *user-defined queries* are stored in a list of most . recently used user-defined queries, retrieved, and displayed.

As amended, claim 5 recites that a method for providing computer software help utility comprises the steps of after receiving a search string and a refined search string at the text entry area, storing the search string and the refined search string in a list of most recently used search strings; retrieving the list of most recently used search strings; and displaying the list of most recently used search strings.

Richards fails to teach or suggest a method for providing computer software help utility as recited in claim 5. On the contrary, as discussed above, Richards discloses a method of providing information to a user by receiving user-defined queries, storing a plurality of predefined information segments (help panels), selecting one of the predefined information segments which corresponds to the user query according to a predetermined criteria, and presenting the selected information segment to the user. However, this is not analogous to the method recited in claim 5 because although the predefined information segments (help panels) selected based on the user-defined queries are stored and presented to the user, Richards fails to teach or suggest that the *user-defined queries* are stored in a list of most recently used user-defined queries, retrieved, and displayed.

As amended, claim 11 recites that a system for providing computer software help utility comprises a software module operative to store the search string and the refined search string in a list of most recently used search strings after receiving the search string and the refined search string at the text entry area; to retrieve the list of most recently used search strings; and to display the list of most recently used search strings.

Richards does not teach or suggest a system for providing computer software help utility as recited in claim 11. Instead, Richards teaches a computer system having a user interface for receiving user-defined queries, a memory for storing a plurality of

11

predefined information segments (help panels), and an apparatus capable of selecting one of the predefined information segments which corresponds to the user query according to a predetermined criteria and presenting the selected information segment to the user. However, Richards fails to teach or suggest a system for providing computer software help utility as recited in claim 11 because although the predefined information segments (help panels) selected based on the user-defined queries are stored and presented to the user, Richards fails to teach or suggest that the *user-defined queries* are stored in a list of most recently used user-defined queries, retrieved, and displayed.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 5, 7, and 11 are allowable over Richards. Since claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, and 12 depend from claims 1, 5, 7, and 11 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the teaching of Richards cannot make obvious claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, and 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-12 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5037.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Christopher J. Leonard
Reg. No. 41,940

| 27488 |
| --- |
| PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE |

Merchant & Gould
3200 IDS Center
80 South 80th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2215
Telephone: 404.954.5100